

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 17, 2002 as been received and is acknowledged. Claims 1-10 are pending in the above-cited application. Claims 1-3 and 7-10 have been amended to address issues raised by the prior Office Action. Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Claims 1-10 are respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

The Office Action objected to the specification, the abstract and claims 2, 3 and 8-10 because of minor informalities. Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestions for changes to the elements of the present application that were objected to. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

In addition, claims 1, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for having limitations that lack sufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have addressed the limitations identified and respectfully assert that the claims are now definite within the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Ahne et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,844). Claims 1-3, 5 and 10 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Ahne et al.* Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Ahne et al.* in view of *Ross et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,027,112). The above rejections are respectfully traversed because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the above claims.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for displaying system state information. The system of the present invention, according to independent claim 1, includes a programmable controller operative to determine the present system state of a system, the programmable controller operative to determine the present system state of the system, the programmable controller providing a signal representative of system state, a driver operative to generate a control signal in response to the signal provided by the programmable controller, and a display device operative to provide a visual representation of the state of the system in response to the control signal. The system has a plurality of ports, with at least one port of the plurality of ports providing at least one of the event signals

The present invention, according to independent claim 7, is directed to a method of operating a display system. The method includes providing event signals representative of a condition of a system to a programmable controller, generating signals representative of system state in response to the event signals and displaying a visual representation of information representing system state in response to signals generated by the programmable controller. The present invention, according to independent claim 9, is directed to a programmable display controller for controlling a display device based on event information indicative of a current one of a set of predefined states of a communication system. The programmable display controller includes a programmable controller responsive to programming information defining a selected display state associated with each of the states of the communication system, the programmable controller being operative to generate a control signal indicative of a current display state

based on the current state of the communication system and said programming information. In both embodiments, the communication system has a plurality of ports, with at least one port of the plurality of ports providing at least one of the event signals

The principle reference applied in the subject Office Action is *Ahne et al.* *Ahne et al.* is directed to a system and method for allowing a user to program characteristics of an LED in order to convey information about the operational status of a printer. The disclosure allows a user at a computer (20, Fig. 1) to program the LED (124-128) functions of the printer (10). The computer receives output status signals from the printer and transmits to an LED driver logic circuitry in the printer display mode information based upon how the computer has been programmed by the user.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “wherein the system has a plurality of ports, with at least one port of the plurality of ports providing at least one of the event signals.” Similar limitations can also be found in independent claims 7 and 9. The “system” in *Ahne et al.* is the printer. As such, the printer in *Ahne et al.* does not teach or suggest such a system having a plurality of ports, with each port providing event signals. By contrast, the printer in *Ahne et al.* only discloses that the control processor of the printer receives an operational status. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that *Ahne et al.* cannot anticipate claims 7-9, as has been asserted in the Office Action. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Similarly, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims of the present invention are also not rendered obvious over the disclosure of *Ahne et al.* The printer in *Ahne et al.*

does not disclose having a plurality of ports and there is no suggestion that a plurality of ports should be added to the printer or that a plurality of ports would be useful to the function of the printer system. Additionally, there is no suggestion in *Ahne et al.* or in the prior art that the LED control system of *Ahne et al.* should be combined with a communications system having a plurality of ports. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that *Ahne et al.* cannot render obvious claims 1-3, 5 and 10, as has been asserted in the Office Action. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 10.

Lastly, claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Ahne et al.* in view of *Ross et al.* In the Office Action, *Ross et al.* was relied upon for its alleged teaching of a display system having a display area defined by an array of LEDs which form a matrix. Even if *Ross et al.* were accepted for what it is alleged to teach, *Ross et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ahne et al.* As such, Applicants respectfully assert that *Ahne et al.* and *Ross et al.* cannot render obvious claims 4 and 6, as has been asserted in the Office Action. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 4 and 6.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 1-10 and that the application be allowed to proceed to issue. If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin F. Turner  
Attorney for applicant  
Reg. No. 43,437

**Customer No. 32294**

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.

14<sup>TH</sup> Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

KFT:noe:lls

Enclosure: Substitute Abstract